DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 252 CE 063 666

AUTHOR	Earnest, Garee W.; And Others
TITLE	Conflict Management Styles as Reflections of Jungian Personality Type Preferences of the Cooperative Extension's North Central Region Directors and District Directors. Summary of Research SR 71.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Dept. of Agricultural Education.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	14p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Role; *Conflict Resolution; *Extension Education; *Personality Traits; Postsecondary Education; Problem Solving; *Rural Extension
IDENTIFIERS	*Cooperative Extension Service; Myers Briggs Type Indicator

ABSTRACT

A descriptive-correlational study was conducted to explore and describe interpersonal conflict management styles, identify psychological type preferences, and examine the relationships between conflict management styles and psychological type preferences as well as selected demographic characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service's North Central Region Directors and District Directors. Study participants were the 12 extension directors and the 68 district directors within region; completed self-report survey forms were obtained from 78 of these 80 administrators (98 percent). The questionnaires used were the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G and the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventories-II. The demographic variables of role status, gender, age, educational degree, major area of study, and tenure were included in the study, with the majority of participants being male, about 51 years of age, holding advanced degrees in the social sciences. Some of the findings were as follows: (1) directors and district directors preferred to use the integrating conflict management style in conflict situation; (2) the majority of the administrators were of the thinking/judging personality style, indicating they make logical, objective, and tough-minded decisions and prefer a decisive, structured, and organized environment; (3) administrators who favored the intuitive style were more apt to use the integrating conflict management style when confronted with a conflict situation; (4) administrators who favored the judging preference were more apt to avoid conflict situations; (5) as tenure in extension increased, the more the administrators preferred to use the avoiding conflict management style; and (6) administrators tended to use the integrating and obliging conflict management styles less as their tenure in an administrative position increased. Recommendations were made to help administrators to understand the strengths and weaknesses inherent within each of the five conflict management styles and work toward being able to use each style appropriately depending upon the situation. (Contains 14 references.) (KC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Summary of
Research

Department of Agricultural Education
The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED357252

Conflict Management Styles as Reflections of Jungian Personality Type Preferences of the Cooperative Extension's North Central Region Directors and District Directors

Garee W. Earnest, N. L. McCaslin, and Jo M. Jones

Conflict is a reality in everyone's life and should be considered a natural process that occurs daily. However, for most, conflict has negative connotations, invokes negative feelings and often leads to destruction (Lindelow and Scott, 1989). "Whether the effect of conflict is good or bad depends on the strategies used to deal with it" (Rahim, 1986, p. vi).

> Today, the . . . administrator is typically faced with a vast array of conflict situations, both within a given institution and between that institution and its various external publics. The manner in which . . . administrators have traditionally handled such conflicts has been based on the belief that conflict should be thoroughly analyzed, suppressed, and eliminated. Conflict therefore was viewed as being dysfunctional and time consuming. Over the years, however, successful administrators have begun to recognize that in many instances conflict can be a sign of a healthy . . . organization (Darling & Brownlee, 1984, p. 243).

Dealing with conflict between and among individuals can be one of the most frustrating and uncomfortable experiences for administrators. According to Schmidt and Tannenbaum (1960), when conflict occurs "strong feelings are frequently aroused, objectivity flies out the window, egos are threatened, and personal relationships are placed in jeopardy" (p. 107). Therefore, it is important for administrators to understand and effectively manage conflict.

Extension administrators are constantly dealing with conflict situations such as "allocation of funds to positions, travel, supplies, etc. [Additionally], ... poor job design and unclear reporting relationships can cause conflict over work arrangements" (Buford and Bedeian, 1988, p. 185). Different work groups within Extension can become entangled in conflict if they pursue different goals and objectives. Extension Directors and District Directors are in positions where they are prone to encounter these conflict situations in their day to day administrative duties.

According to Rahim (1986), studies conducted in the area of organizational conflict management have (a) "attempted to measure the amount of conflict at various organizational levels and to explore the sources of such conflict;" and (b) "related the various styles of handling interpersonal conflict of the organizational participants and their effects on quality of problem solution" (p. 27). Therefore, Rahim (1986) concluded that it is essential to understand the distinction between the amount of conflict at numerous levels and the styles used to handle interpersonal conflict. This data will pro-

CE063666

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

vide administrators insight regarding psychological type preferences and how they influence an individual's conflict management style. This knowledge will be useful when they are: (a) building teams, (b) encouraging creativity among faculty, (c) building group dynamics, (d) exploring job satisfaction, and (e) examining work productivity of faculty.

Statement of the Problem

The Extension Service administrators and educators are constantly confronted with conflict situations in dealing with groups, clientele, volunteers, peers, superiors and subordinates. Kindler (1983) stated that "when managers handle differences well, they can identify underlying concerns, stimulate creative effort, reduce antagonistic feelings, correct misunderstandings and marshall commitment to needed change" (p. 27). Managers must be able to use a broad repertoire of conflict management strategies. Therefore, in order to provide Extension administrators with the skills needed to effectively manage conflict, an excellent starting point would be for them to understand their conflict management styles when dealing with one another in superior/subordinate relationships.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this descriptive-correlational study was to (a) explore and describe interpersonal conflict management styles, (b) identify psychological type preferences, and (c) examine the relationships between conflict management styles and psychological type preferences as well as selected demographic characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service's North Central Region Directors and District Directors. Additionally, regression models were constructed to explain the variance in conflict management styles of administrators due to personality type preferences and demographic characteristics. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. describe the conflict management styles of the Cooperative Extension Service's North Central Region Directors and District Directors.
2. describe the psychological type preferences of the Cooperative Extension Service's North Central Region Directors and District Directors.
3. describe what relationships existed between conflict management styles and psychological type preferences of Directors and District Directors.
4. describe what relationships existed among conflict management styles and personal characteristics of Directors and District Directors.
5. describe what relationships existed among psychological type preferences and personal characteristics of Directors and District Directors.
6. determine the proportion of variance in the conflict management styles of Directors and District Directors that could be explained by the independent variables of gender, personality type preferences, and role status and the extraneous variables of age, tenure, educational degree and major area of study.

Methodology

This exploratory study was descriptive-correlational in nature. Data were examined to determine the nature and strength of the relationship between variables. Additionally, stepwise multiple regression models were constructed to measure the proportion of variance in the conflict management styles of Directors and District Directors that could be explained by selected characteristics.

Population and Sampling

The participants in this descriptive-correlational census study were the 12 Extension Directors and the 68 District Directors within the Cooperative Extension's North Central Region. Completed surveys were obtained from 78 of the 80 administrators for a total response rate of 97.5 percent.

Instrumentation

Two self-report questionnaires, the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Form G* and the *Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventories-II (ROCI-II) Forms A and B*, were used to measure the variables of interest. The MBTI, based upon Jungian theory (Jung, 1923), was used to assess the psychological type preferences. Four dichotomous scales, transformed into four continuous scales, are used throughout the MBTI: extraversion (E) or introversion (I) — reflects whether a person's attitude is oriented primarily toward the outer world or the inner world; sensing (S) or intuition (N) — describes the function of how information is perceived; thinking (T) or feeling (F) — describes the preference for making judgments; and judging (J) or perceiving (P) — describes the attitude toward dealing with the outer world.

The ROCI-II measures five independent conflict management dimensions that represent styles of handling interpersonal conflict, which are measured on a summated five point Likert scale, with one indicating strongly disagree and five indicating strongly agree. These five conflict management styles are integrating — a win/win solution acceptable to both parties; obliging — satisfying the concern of the other party; dominating — a win/lose orientation or forcing one's position; avoiding — withdrawing, passing-the-buck or sidestepping the situation; and compromising — both parties give up something to reach a mutually acceptable solution. Form A measures how an organizational member handles conflict with his or her superior and was used with the District Directors. Form B measures how an organizational member handles conflict with his or her subordinate and was used with the Directors.

Both instruments were field tested to ensure face and content validity using five Extension administrators within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. Reliability and internal consistency were calculated for both MBTI and ROCI-II. The MBTI test-retest product-moment correlations were .96 EI, .95 SN, .77 TF and .90 JP while the split-half reliabilities were .83 EI, .89 SN, .83 TF, and .77 JP. The ROCI-II test-retest product-moment correlations were .40 integrating, .93 obliging, .95 dominating, .77 avoiding, and .69 compromising while the Cronbach's alphas were .84 integrating, .78 obliging, .72 dominating, .80 avoiding and .56 compromising.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were obtained through use of descriptive survey research. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and organize the data. Measures of association were utilized to determine the linear relationship between the conflict management styles, the Myers-Briggs Type preferences and selected demographic characteristics. "The conventional notation for MBTI correlations is followed, such that *positive correlations are associated with I, N, F, or P, and negative correlations are associated with E, S, T, or J* (Myers and McCaulley, 1985, p. 176, emphasis added by authors). The conventions by Davis (1971) were used in describing the measures of association.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine the best predictor(s) of the dependent variable — conflict management styles of Directors and District Directors. The dependent variable for the regression model in this study was the interval scores on each of the five conflict management styles. The independent and extraneous variables entered into the regression model included: position, tenure in extension, tenure in current position, tenure as an administrator, gender, age, major field of study, educational degree, extravert/introvert preference, sensing/intuition preference, thinking/feeling preference, and judging/perceiving preference. The total R^2 was computed to determine the amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of the independent and extraneous variables. Stepwise multiple regression was only used to describe the respondents in the study. No hypothesis testing was conducted

and no inferences were made to this population or to any other similar population.

Findings

The demographic variables of role status, gender, age, educational degree, major area of study and tenure were included in this study. Of the 78 individuals that provided data, the majority (76.9 percent) were male whereas less than one-fourth (23.1 percent) were female. The mean ages were 52.6 and 50.1 years for Directors and District Directors respectively. Nearly 92 percent of the Directors held a doctorate degree whereas slightly more than 71 percent of the District Directors held a master's degree. The majority (74.4 percent) of the respondents' major area of study for their highest academic degree was in the social sciences. The average number of years employed in Extension was over 22 years for both Directors and District Directors. Two-thirds (66.7 percent) of the Directors and nearly 40 percent of the District Directors had less than five years experience in their current positions. The average tenure as an administrator, including service in other organizations, was 15.7 years and 11.9 years for Directors and District Directors respectively.

Conflict Management Styles

Both the Directors and the District Directors, as shown in Table 1, indicated that the integrating conflict management style was their most preferred style when they were found to be in a conflict situation. The mean scores for the integrating style were 4.81 and 4.32, respectively. Directors were found to be significantly more integrating than the District Directors but no significant differences were found between the administrators on the remaining four styles.

Myers-Briggs Type Preferences

Of the population shown in Table 2, the majority (26.9 percent) was of the ESTJ personality type whereas the majority (33.3 percent) of the Directors was of the ISTJ personality type. The ENTJ personality type accounted for the second largest percentage (15.2 percent) of District Directors whereas the ESTJ personality type accounted for the second largest percentage (25 percent) of Directors.

The individual with an ESTJ personality preference is practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, has a head for business, likes to organize and run activities and makes a good administrator if they consider other's feelings. An individual with an ISTJ personality preference is serious, quiet, practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic, dependable, well organized but will work toward a goal regardless of distractions. Those individuals who prefer the ENTJ personality preference are hearty, frank, leaders in activities, good at reasoning and public speaking, well informed but may appear more confident than their experience warrants (Myers and Myers, 1987).

Relationships Between Variables

Correlations, shown in Table 3, between conflict management styles and MBTI preferences revealed that the intuition preference had a low (Davis, 1971) correlation with the integrating conflict management style while the sensing preference had a low correlation with the avoiding and compromising conflict management styles. The judging preference was shown to have a low correlation with the avoiding conflict management style.

Measures of association between conflict management styles and selected demographic characteristics indicated that the integrating and obliging styles showed a low correlation with tenure as an administrator. The dominating style had a low correlation with tenure in current position while the avoiding style had a low correlation with tenure in Extension.

The associations between the MBTI preferences and selected characteristics, as

Table 1
MEAN CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES SCORES FOR DIRECTORS AND DISTRICT DIRECTORS (N = 78)

Group	n	Mean	sd	t
Integrating				
Director	12	4.81	.27	< .001*
District Director	66	4.32	.47	
Obliging				
Director	12	3.51	.31	.34
District Director	66	3.68	.59	
Dominating				
Director	12	2.90	.88	.40
District Director	66	3.13	.57	
Avoiding				
Director	12	2.72	.82	.36
District Director	66	2.96	.77	
Compromising				
Director	12	3.58	.64	.30
District Director	66	3.79	.48	

Note. 1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree; * $p < .05$

Table 2
MYERS-BRIGGS TYPES OF EXTENSION ADMINISTRATORS (N = 78)

	All Administrators (n = 78)		Directors (n = 12)		District Directors (n = 66)	
MBTI Type	n	%	n	%	n	%
ISTJ	11	14.1	4	33.3	7	10.6
ISFJ	2	2.6	0	0.0	2	3.0
INFJ	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.5
INTJ	4	5.1	0	0.0	4	6.1
ISTP	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.5
ISFP	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.5
INFP	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.5
INTP	3	3.8	0	0.0	3	4.5
ESTP	3	3.8	1	8.3	2	3.0
ESFP	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ENFP	5	6.4	2	16.7	3	4.5
ENTP	6	7.7	1	8.3	5	7.6
ESTJ	21	26.9	3	25.0	18	27.3
ESFJ	5	6.4	0	0.0	5	7.6
ENFJ	4	5.1	1	8.3	3	4.5
ENTJ	10	12.8	0	0.0	10	15.2

Note. E = Extravert, I = Introvert; S = Sensing, N = Intuition; T = Thinking, F = Feeling; J = Judging; P = Perceiving

shown in Table 4, indicated that the intuition preference had a low association with major area of study and educational degree. The associations between conflict management styles and selected characteristics indicated that the integrating conflict management style showed a moderate association with role status while the obliging conflict management style showed a moderate association with educational degree.

Results of the Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses

Using stepwise multiple regression analysis, as shown in Table 5, it was determined that the linear combination of three characteristics could account for 25.9 percent of the variance in the integrating conflict management style. Role status, the first characteristic entered into the model, accounted for 14 percent of the total variance in the integrating style. Years as an administrator accounted for an additional 6.3 percent of the variance while the intuition preference added an additional 5.6 percent of the variance.

Only one characteristic in Table 6, educational degree, accounted for 10.6 percent of the variance in the obliging conflict management style. Likewise in Table 7, only one characteristic, the sensing preference, accounted for 5.9 percent of the variance in the avoiding conflict management style. No characteristics were found to account for any variance in either the dominating or the compromising conflict management styles.

Conclusions

Based upon the review of literature and the findings related to the research objectives, the following conclusions, applicable to the population of this study, were reached:

1. Directors and District Directors indicated they preferred to use the integrating conflict management style when confronted with a conflict situation.
2. The majority of the administrators were of the thinking/judging personality style indicating they make logical, objective, and tough-minded decisions and prefer a decisive, structured and organized environment.
3. Administrators who favored the intuitive preference were more apt to use the integrating conflict management style when confronted with a conflict situation.
4. Administrators who favored the sensing preference tended to handle conflict situations using the avoiding or compromising conflict management styles.
5. Administrators who favored the judging preference were more apt to avoid conflict situations.
6. As tenure in Extension increased, the more the administrators preferred to use the avoiding conflict management style.
7. The longer administrators remained in their current position, the more they tended to dominate the conflict situation.
8. Directors and District Directors tended to use the integrating and obliging conflict management styles less as their tenure in an administrative position increased.
9. Administrators who held a master's degree or less were more apt to use the obliging conflict management style than those who held a doctoral degree.
10. The best predictors of the integrating conflict management style included role status, years as an administrator, and the intuitive preference of the perceiving function.
11. The obliging conflict management style was best predicted by educational degree.
12. The best predictor of the avoiding conflict management style was the sensing preference of the perceiving function.

Table 3

Summary Data: Intercorrelations Between Selected Characteristics and Conflict Management Styles (N = 78)

Characteristics	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5	X_6	X_7	X_8	X_9	X_{10}	X_{11}	X_{12}	Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5	Mean	sd
Intercorrelations																			
Role Status[a] (X_1)	1.00	.02	.20*	-.18	-.07	-.13	-.01	-.50*	-.10	-.08	.09	.07	-.37*	.11	.13	.11	.15	.85	.36
Yrs Extension (X_2)		1.00	.46*	.36*	.07	.64*	.23*	.02	.07	-.30*	-.03	-.24*	-.11	.01	.00	.20*	.06	22.85	8.39
Yrs Current Position (X_3)			1.00	.41*	.02	.51*	.14	.00	.08	.01	.13	-.02	-.05	-.03	.18*	-.06	.07	6.92	5.82
Yrs Administrator (X_4)				1.00	.14	.55*	.17	.26*	.05	.07	-.24*	-.06	-.18*	-.29*	.10	-.02	-.04	12.49	7.76
Gender[b] (X_5)					1.00	.12	-.32*	.35*	.16	-.10	-.16	-.09	-.12	-.14	-.02	-.04	-.10	.77	.42
Age (X_6)						1.00	.00	.22*	.05	-.15	-.03	-.13	-.14	-.14	.14	.11	-.03	50.45	7.22
Major Area of Study[c] (X_7)							1.00	-.05	.05	.21*	.04	.02	.05	.03	-.01	.12	.01	.74	.44
Educational Degree[d] (X_8)								1.00	.17	.24*	-.09	-.01	.07	-.33*	.01	-.10	-.13	.36	.48
MBTI Preferences																			
Extravert/Introvert (X_9)									1.00	-.20*	-.25*	-.14	.02	-.17	-.12	.00	-.07	90.36	25.38
Sensing/Intuition (X_{10})										1.00	.25*	.60*	.25*	-.16	.09	-.24*	-.19*	96.87	32.07
Thinking/Feeling (X_{11})											1.00	.32*	.07	.12	.05	-.05	.03	81.85	24.71
Judging/Perceiving (X_{12})												1.00	.17	-.05	.04	-.22*	-.14	84.95	28.99
Conflict Mgt. Styles																			
Integrating (Y_1)													1.00	.11	-.16	-.19*	.40*	4.40	.47
Obliging (Y_2)														1.00	-.11	.50*	.23*	3.66	.55
Dominating (Y_3)															1.00	.13	-.02	3.09	.62
Avoiding (Y_4)																1.00	.17	2.93	.78
Compromising (Y_5)																	1.00	3.76	.51

Note. Coefficients reported as Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations.

Conventional notation for MBTI correlations: positive correlations are associated with I, N, F, or P and negative correlations are associated with E, S, T, or J

a: Director = 0, District Director = 1; b: Female = 0, Male = 1; c: Natural Science = 0, Social Science = 1; d: Master's or less = 0, Doctoral = 1

* $p < .05$

Table 4
Relationship Between Role Status, Gender, Major Area of Study and Educational Degree with MBTI Preferences and Conflict Management Styles (N = 78)

Characteristics	Role Status[a]	Gender[b]	Major Area[c] of Study	Educational[d] Degree
MBTI Preferences				
Extravert/Introvert	-.10	.16	.05	.17
Sensing/Intuition	-.08	-.10	.21*	.24*
Thinking/Feeling	.09	-.16	.04	-.09
Judging/Perceiving	.07	-.09	.02	-.01
Conflict Mgt. Styles				
Integrating	-.37*	-.12	.05	.07
Obliging	.11	-.14	.03	-.33*
Dominating	.13	-.02	-.01	.01
Avoiding	.11	-.04	.12	-.10
Compromising	.15	-.10	.01	-.13

NOTE: Coefficients reported as Point-biserial correlations
a: Directors = 0; District Directors = 1
b: Females = 0; Males = 1
c: Natural Science = 0, Social Science = 1
d: Master's or less = 0; Doctoral = 1
* $p < .05$

Table 5
Regression of Integrating Conflict Management Style with Selected Variables - Stepwise Entry (N = 78)

Variables	R^2	R^2_{Change}	b	t	p
Role status[a]	.140	.140	-.526	-3.95	< .001
Years an Administrator	.203	.063	-.016	-2.65	.010
Sensing/Intuition	.259	.056	.004	2.36	.021
(Constant)			4.706		

Std. Error = .417
Adjusted R^2 = .230
For model: F = 8.63; $p < .001$
a: Director = 0; District Director = 1

Table 6
REGRESSION OF OBLIGING CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLE WITH SELECTED VARIABLES - STEPWISE ENTRY (N = 78)

Variables	R^2	R^2_{Change}	b	t	p
Educational Degree[a]	.106	.106	-.374	-3.00	.004
(Constant)			3.791		

Std. Error = .528
Adjusted R^2 = .094
For model: F = 9.00; p < .01
a: Master's or less = 0; Doctoral = 1

Implications

As described in various studies (Chanin & Scheer, 1984; Rahim, 1983; and Kilmann & Thomas, 1975), personality preferences of individuals and how they affected their conflict management styles did not indicate any significant type of trends. The sensing preference was found to be significantly correlated with the compromising conflict management style in this study as well as in the Chanin and Scheer study. The other personality preferences were correlated at a low or moderate level with an individual's conflict management styles but no one preference was clearly associated with one or more of the conflict management styles of Directors and District Directors. Therefore, those Directors and District Directors who favored the sensing preference would be more apt to compromise because they are practical, realistic, present-oriented, and like specific concrete facts.

Directors (superiors) used the integrating conflict management style in dealing with their District Directors (subordinates). This supports Lee's (1990) findings that managers reported using the integrating style with their subordinates. The majority of the District Directors also indicated that they used the integrating style with their Directors. This does not support Lee's (1990) findings that managers reported using the obliging style with their superiors. This implies that (a) the District Directors in the North Central Region were more willing to collaborate and problem solve with their Directors to find an acceptable

Table 7
REGRESSION OF AVOIDING CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLE WITH SELECTED VARIABLES - STEPWISE ENTRY (N = 78)

Variables	R^2	R^2_{Change}	b	t	p
Sensing/Intuition	.059	.059	-.006	-2.18	.032
(Constant)			3.500		

Std. Error = .762
Adjusted R^2 = .047
For model: F = 4.76; p < .05

solution to a conflict situation or (b) the Directors provided an atmosphere where the District Directors felt more comfortable using the integrating style.

Gender of the Directors and District Directors did not play a significant role in their selection of a conflict management style. The literature showed inconsistencies when examining conflict management styles of males and females. However, the findings in this study coincided with those of Renwick (1977) when she looked at how male and female managers dealt with differences involving their immediate supervisor. She found no difference between the males and the females in use of conflict management styles.

The literature does not address how various extraneous variables affect an individual's selection of a conflict management style; however, this study indicated that tenure of the individual correlates with their choice of styles. The findings indicated that those Directors and District Directors who had been employed in Extension for a considerable amount of time were more likely to avoid conflict situations. This may be due to the fact that: confronting the issue would be more dysfunctional for the administrator or the other participants; the issue is trivial and not really worth the administrator's time and effort; or the situation is best avoided until the participants have had a cooling off period. The avoidance style is the best approach to use in these situations (Rahim, 1983).

The length of tenure in their current position and as an administrator tended to affect the choice of conflict management styles of Directors and District Directors. The more time spent in their current position, the more the Directors and District Directors tended to dominate the conflict situation. However, the longer they had been in an administrative position the less they used the integrating and obliging styles. This suggests that Directors and District Directors were more confident and felt more secure in their positions as administrators and did not believe it was necessary to collaborate and use problem solving skills.

No studies were found that used multiple regression analyses to account for the variance in an individual's choice of conflict management styles. However, the sensing or the intuition preferences made significant contributions to explaining variance in two of the five conflict management styles. The more practical, realistic, and concrete the administrator (sensing), the more apt they were to use the avoiding or compromising conflict management styles whereas the more theoretical, imaginative and conceptual the administrator (intuition), the more apt they were to use the integrating conflict management style.

Recommendations

The review of literature, the findings of this study, and the subsequent conclusions and implications led to several recommendations for both the Cooperative Extension Service's North Central Region Directors and District Directors and for further study. Following are these recommendations:

Recommendations for the Cooperative Extension Service

1. Directors and District Directors need to understand the strengths and weaknesses inherent within each of the five conflict management styles and work toward being able to appropriately use each style depending upon the situation.
2. Extension administrators need to recognize and appreciate the diversity of personality type within their organization as this awareness can lead to (a) a better understanding of group dynamics, (b) building an empowered team, and (c) managing conflict in a constructive manner.
3. Extension administrators with considerable tenure should analyze the costs and benefits before using the avoiding conflict management style. If the benefits of resolving the conflict

out weigh the costs or losses, then another conflict management style should be used to resolve the conflict and to avoid further complications.

4. It is recommended that the Directors and District Directors incorporate training and update sessions on conflict management and mediation techniques and skills into their inservice education programs and management retreats.
5. All new Extension educators' orientation should incorporate sessions on conflict management and mediation skills.
6. A short course on conflict management and mediation skills for all Extension educators should be offered at the Minnesota or North Carolina Extension Summer Schools.
7. It is recommended that conflict management and mediation be included as a major component of any graduate level course on administration and management in Extension or adult education.

Recommendations for further study

1. It is recommended that this study be replicated in the other three regions of the Cooperative Extension Service. Then, comparisons of the results of the four populations could be made.
2. Since this study dealt exclusively with the quantitative aspect of conflict management styles, a qualitative aspect should be an added component of future studies to insure a triangulation of results. This would involve case study analysis, face-to-face interviews, and/or direct observation with the participants to help assess other potential extraneous variables and to assure the accuracy of the self-reporting of conflict management styles.
3. After reading and hearing comments from Directors and District Directors of the Extension Service's North Central Region, it was concluded that Associate Directors would be a more appropriate audience to use as the immediate supervisor of District Directors in each state. Therefore, future studies should be based upon who the immediate supervisor is in each state.
4. It is recommended that this study be replicated using District Directors as superiors and county chairs as subordinates to ascertain how these groups handle conflict when in a conflict situation with one another.
5. It is recommended that this study be replicated using county chairs as superiors and county personnel as subordinates to ascertain how these groups handle conflict when in a conflict situation with one another.
6. It is recommended that this study be replicated using Directors as superiors and Associate Directors as subordinates to ascertain how these groups handle conflict when in a conflict situation with one another.

References

Buford, J. A. & Bedeian, A. G. (1988). *Management in extension (2nd ed)*. Auburn, AL: Auburn University, Alabama Cooperative Extension Service.

Chanin, M. A. & Scheer, J. A. (1984). A study of the relationship between jungian personality dimensions and conflict-handling behavior. *Human Relations, 37*(10), 863-879.

Darling, J. R. & Brownlee, L. J. (1984). Conflict management in the academic institution. *Texas Tech Journal of Education, 21*(Fall), 243-257.

Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types; or the psychology of individuation*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Kilmann, R. H. & Thomas, K. W. (1975). Interpersonal conflict-handling behavior as reflections of jungian personality dimensions. *Psychological Reports, 37*(Part 1), 971-980.

Kindler, H. S. (1983). The art of managing differences. *Training and Development Journal*, (January), 26-32.

Lee, C. (1990). Relative status of employees and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: An experimental study with Korean managers.

The International Journal of Conflict Management, 1(4), 327-340.

Lidelow, J. & Scott, J. J. (1989). Managing conflict. In *School leadership: Handbook for excellence* (pp. 387-355). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 309 519)

Myers, I. B. & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the myers-briggs type indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). *Rahim organizational conflict inventories: Professional manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rahim, M. A. (1986). *Managing conflict in organizations*. New York: Praeger.

Renwick, P. A. (1977). The effects of sex differences on the perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict: An exploratory study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19*(2), 403-415.

Schmidt, W. H. & Tannenbaum, R. (1960). Management of differences. *Harvard Business Review, 38*(6), 107-115.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH SERIES

Dealing with conflict between and among individuals can be one of the most frustrating and uncomfortable experiences for administrators. Extension Directors and District Directors are in positions where they are prone to encounter these conflict situations in their day to day administrative duties. This study describes interpersonal conflict management styles, identifies psychological type preferences, and examines the relationships between conflict management styles and psychological type preferences as well as selected demographic characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service's North Central Region Directors and District Directors. This study should help Extension Directors and District Directors recognize and appreciate the diversity of personality types within their organizations and point out the importance of incorporating conflict management and mediation skill training into their inservice education program.

This summary is based on a dissertation by Garee W. Earnest under the direction of N. L. McCaslin and Jo M. Jones. Garee W. Earnest was a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. He is currently an Extension Associate, Leadership Development with Ohio State University Extension. Dr. McCaslin is an Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Education and Dr. Jones is an Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University. Special appreciation is due to Brenda Seevers, New Mexico State University; Dick McCallum, University of Minnesota; and R. Kirby Barrick, The Ohio State University for their critical review of the manuscript prior to publication.

Research has been an important function of the Department of Agricultural Education since it was established in 1917. Research conducted by the Department has generally been in the form of graduate theses, staff studies, and funded research. It is the purpose of this series to make useful knowledge from such research available to practitioners in the profession. Individuals desiring additional information on this topic should examine the references cited.

Wesley E. Budke, Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Education

SR 71 1993